

EPA PROJECT OFFICER POST-AWARD EVALUATION PROTOCOL
(USED FOR ADVANCED AND BASELINE MONITORING)
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM OFFICE (CBPO)

To prevent potential problems with the Paperwork Reduction Act, Project Officers should not give this protocol to the recipient or direct the issues as questions to the recipient.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION (PART 1)

MID YEAR/SIX MONTH: <u> X </u> CLOSEOUT: <u> </u>	GRANT NUMBER(s): CB97377601							
1. DATE PREPARED: 4/22/14	2. RECIPIENT NAME: PA Dept of Environmental Protection							
3. ENTER ALL DATES: a. OFF-SITE CONFERENCE CALL DATE: 4/22/14 b. ON-SITE REVIEW DATE: NA (enter date if applicable, otherwise N/A) c. REPORT DATE: 4/23/14 (Date Report Sent by Email to Grantee) d. CLOSED DATE: 4/25/14 (Date all major issues resolved, if applicable, otherwise this date is same as Report Date.)	4. PROJECT OFFICER(s): PARTICIPANTS/PERSONS CONTACTED: (Names /Affiliations) -EPA: Holly Waldman, CBPO - GRANTEE: Steve Taglang and Dave Lewis, PA DEP							
5. <u>AWARD INFORMATION</u> Grant <u> X </u> Cooperative Agreement <u> </u>	6. <u>PROJECT / BUDGET PERIOD DATES:</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th align="center" data-bbox="740 1289 1203 1331">BEGINNING</th> <th align="center" data-bbox="1203 1289 1521 1331">ENDING</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="740 1331 1203 1388">Project Period: 7/01/2009</td> <td data-bbox="1203 1331 1521 1388">6/30/2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="740 1388 1203 1467">Budget Period: 7/01/2009</td> <td data-bbox="1203 1388 1521 1467">6/30/2014</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		BEGINNING	ENDING	Project Period: 7/01/2009	6/30/2014	Budget Period: 7/01/2009	6/30/2014
BEGINNING	ENDING							
Project Period: 7/01/2009	6/30/2014							
Budget Period: 7/01/2009	6/30/2014							
7. <u>AWARD AMOUNT</u> EPA share: \$11,385,000 Recipient share/Match: \$11,385,000 EPA IN-KIND: NA Total: \$22,770,000	8. <u>BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</u> This grant agreement aids the recipient in the implementation of BMPs that reduce nutrient and sediment pollution in PA's portion of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. This work will achieve and maintain the water quality necessary to improve the aquatic living resources of the Bay and it's tributaries.							

BACKGROUND INFORMATION (PART 1) CONTINUED

9. PROVIDE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RECIPIENT:

Provide Background Information of Recipient, i.e. State Agency, University, Local Government, and Not For Profit. Background Information may be included in Statement of Work. (Example: This is a “Not For Profit” membership organization representing a broad coalition of interests united in support of the conservation, protection and restoration of the Potomac River watershed.....). If background information is not included in the Statement of Work, request recipient to e-mail their description to you.

Response: The state of Pennsylvania is a signatory to the 1983, 1987 and 2000 Chesapeake Bay agreements. DEP is the lead state agency for implementing Bay restoration and water quality improvement activities in the Potomac and Susquehanna river basins.

10. DISCUSS PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCERNS/OPEN PROGRAMMATIC FINDINGS, IF ANY EXIST; ARE THEY OR WILL THEY BE REMEDIED?:

a. Open Programmatic Findings in Last Monitoring Review (Refer to Part II, Item 7, PO Suggestions and Recommendations). If applicable, are there any open programmatic findings for this Award in last monitoring review (could not provide a “closed date” on last monitoring review report because of major finding(s))? Provide date of resolution and explanation on how finding(s) have been resolved.

Response: NA

RESULTS OF REVIEW WITH RECOMMENDATIONS (success & findings) - PART II

1. Scope of Review: Summarize the purpose of your review.

If appropriate, list issues that will be raised for resolution during the review (e.g., need response on why the recipient spent half of the grant award and hasn’t produced a literature review).

Response: Conduct a six-month review to assess progress toward achieving commitments as outlined in the workplan and ensure that all deliverables have been submitted and approved as required to date.

2. Financial: POs are responsible for:

>Analyzing the budget information in the reports by reviewing the payment history (using recipient progress reports, Financial Status Reports, or Compass Data Warehouse reports) and comparing actual amounts spent against the planned budget in the work plan.

>Providing rebudget approval to the Grants Specialist on the recipients request to rebudget grant funds or on other actions which require prior approval from EPA.

PO to Review, Discuss, and Respond:

a. Has the recipient begun work under this assistance agreement? If no, provide explanation.

Response: Yes

b. How is this award funded ? (Fully, Incrementally, Supplementary)

Response: Incrementally

If response is incrementally funded then complete the following questions:

- Have all increments been funded?

Response: Yes

Enter an explanation: This is a multi-year (5 year) award and will be ending June 30, 2014. (BP/PP = 7/01/09 – 6/30/14).

- **The current total funding for this award, which includes the incremental funding:**

If response is for *supplementary funded* awards, complete the following information:

- **Amount the Recipient has received in supplemental funding:**

Response: NA

- **The current total funding for this award, which includes the supplemental funding:**

Response: NA

c. Ensure funds are available to complete the project:

Answer the following:

*Amount of EPA funds awarded: \$11,385,000

*Amount of EPA funds paid: \$9,404,482.49

*Remaining Balance: \$1,980,517.51

% of Project Completed: 83%

% of Funds Paid: 83%

* Information found on Compass Data Warehouse Report at

<http://ocfosystem1.epa.gov/neis/adw.welcome>

d. Is the recipient making draw-downs on this award in accordance with the workplan since the award date or last monitoring review?

Response: Yes – the recipient has made 40 draw-downs since the 11/22/13 monitoring review.

e. Is the payment history consistent with the progress to date?

Response: Yes

f. Do the drawdowns seem reasonable and capture the progress to date based on the project duration and workplan?

Response: Yes – the expended and remaining funds are reasonable. According to our Compass system, \$1,980,517.51 has been spent since the July 2009 start of the award.

g. Is the remaining funding on this award necessary to complete the project?

Response: Yes

h. Verify with recipient if there is enough funding in place to cover expected costs? If no, provide explanation. (Contact either Lori Mackey or Holly Waldman for assistance to possibly add funds)

Response: Yes

i. Are the Project/Budget Period(s) long enough to cover the time that it will take to complete the project? If no, provide explanation.. (Contact either Lori Mackey or Holly Waldman for assistance prior to requesting time extension request from recipient.)

Response: No – the recipient is considering requesting a 6 month no-cost extension.

j. Does the recipient's most current EPA approved work plan require any PO/Grant Office

approvals/amendments for cost or activities not included in the original award? Respond to the following:

- **Movement/transfer of funds in grantee's total approved budget more than 10% between cost categories.**

Response: No, not within the last 6 months.

- **Re-budgeting between direct and indirect costs (Part 30 or 31 recipients only).**

Response: No, not within the last 6 months.

- **Changes to equipment costs not included in the most current approved work plan.**

Response: NA

- **Changes in key personnel.** (Ex: Has turnover in staff caused delays in completing the funded activities?) Yes or No response required. Also, note if the changes were either 1) approved and recipient notified; or 2) conditionally approved and recipient notified; or 3) denied and recipient notified.

Response: Pat Buckley (PA primary staff person for EPA/CBP) left the recipient agency January 24, 2014. Ms. Buckley's departure will be reflected in the next progress report.

- **Food or refreshments at events not identified in most current approved work plan.**

Response: No

- **Unplanned travel expenses not identified in most current approved work plan.**

Response: No

- **Changes in the project's approved scope of work.**

Response: No

3. Technical: POs are responsible for:

- > *comparing the recipient's work plan/application to actual progress under the award.*
- > *monitoring all activities and the recipient's progress on the project.*
- > *providing comments to the recipient on the progress reports and other work products.*
- > *apprizing program staff who are responsible for parts of the project/program on issues which need resolution.*
- > *recommending actions that require the attention of Grants Office or others.*

a. List work plan/application tasks, compare to actual work progress, and identify areas of concern cited in the progress report. Provide a summary of each task and current status:

Response:

<i>Objective 1: Program Management, Evaluation and Planning</i>
Activities for the July 2013 – December 2013 period: Point Source data submitted to EPA December 12, 2013. The following TMDL-related activities were performed by PA DEP Central Office staff during the

period of July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013.

Sediment and/or Nutrient TMDLs (AVGWLF Method)

The following TMDLs cover a number of watersheds, all having sediment and/or nutrient impairments. Some watersheds may be repeated from the last report as the TMDL development and approval process spans more than one reporting period and, depending on circumstances, may not be developed and approved in consecutive reporting periods.

- Implertown Run – Bedford County – 25 segments
- Pleasant Valley Run – Bedford County – 13 segments
- Big Cove Creek – Fulton County – 5 segments
- Cove Run – Fulton County – 14 segments
- Johnston Run – Fulton County – 12 segments
- Little Trough Creek – Huntington County – 4 segments
- Warble Run – Juniata County – 6 segments

TMDL development activities for these watersheds for the July through December (2012) timeframe may include:

- Completed background information collection (pre-existing WQ data, BMP data)
- Planning documents, initial field reconnaissance, etc.
- Completed reference watershed search
- Completed AVGWLF model runs for determining TMDL endpoints
- Report generation and public participation

Objective 2: TMDL Development

Activities for the July 2013 – December 2013 period:

Nutrient and Sediment TMDLs

The following FY 2014 TMDLs cover a number of watersheds, all having sediment and/or nutrient impairments.

- Spruce Creek
- Little Chiques Creek
- South Branch Conewago
- Howe Run
- Kase Run
- Little Lost Creek
- Markee Creek
- Warble Run

TMDL development activities for these watersheds for the July through December (2013) timeframe include:

- Completed drafts of Spruce, South Branch Conewago, and Little Chiques, all currently on hold for EPA submittal, at PADEP request.
- Background research completed for Howe, Kase, Little Lost, Markee and Warble Run, but further movement on how awaiting other pending decisions.

Nutrient and Sediment TMDLs

The following FY2013 TMDLs cover a number of watersheds, all having sediment and/or nutrient impairments.

- Completed final comments and revisions for below TMDLs based on input from USEPA Region 3
 - Warrior Run
 - Opossum Creek

Cedar Run (13 listed TMDL segments)

TMDL focusing on nutrient and sediment from predominantly urban and agricultural sources

- Collected one storm samples and one baseflow water chemistry rounds and one round of macro invertebrate sampling at all sites.
- Continued coordination with the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay regarding their urban restoration efforts within the watershed
- Continued ongoing operation and maintenance of two real-time water quality stations on Cedar Run watershed, to determine baseline conditions.

Conestoga River (125 listed TMDL segments)

TMDL focusing on nutrients and sediment from nonpoint sources, but also includes an evaluation of point sources that contribute nutrients to streams in the watershed

- Continued coordination efforts with County Planning, Conservation District and local municipalities on TMDL schedule, data and county activities.
- Collected one round of water chemistry and macroinvertebrate collection in September.

Octoraro Creek (28 listed TMDL segments – includes 3 listed for public water supply)

- Completed Draft TMDL and submitted to DEP and EPA for comment.
- Reviewed and recalculated model runs for new approach at PADEP requests.
- Resubmitted draft TMDL to PADEP and EPA, and reposted in bulletin, currently awaiting comments.

Objective 3: Chesapeake Bay Education Office

Activities for the July 2013 – December 2013 period:

Deliverable #1:

Annual Chesapeake Bay Program Conservation District and PA Agency Staff Meeting (In Progress)

- PACD facilitates an annual Chesapeake Bay Program Conservation District and PA Agency Staff Meeting including coordinating site needs, managing registration, and assembling/distributing program materials.

- PACD interfaces with conservation districts to identify their meeting agenda needs and shares the items with a Meeting Planning Workgroup. PACD facilitates the activities of the workgroup to develop the agenda and secure speakers.
- PACD facilitates meeting wrap-up responsibilities including post-meeting information dissemination including posting of resources on the Chesapeake Bay Education page of the website (<http://pacd.org/education/chesapeake-bay-education-office>) evaluation compilation and interpretation, general close-out activities, and initiation of planning for the next year's meeting.

Project Timeline:

Prepare for March 2014 Chesapeake Bay Program Conservation District and PA Agency Staff Meeting: Ongoing, through February 2014
 Coordinate planning meetings: Ongoing, through February 2014
 Host 2014 Chesapeake Bay Program Conservation District and PA Agency Staff Meeting: March 2014
 Summarize and distribute meeting evaluations: April 2014
 Post handouts and presentations on the PACD website: April 2014
 Participate in Committee Wrap-up session: April 2014

Deliverables #2 & #3: Web Presence and Information Dissemination

(Ongoing)

PACD maintains a Chesapeake Bay Education Office presence on its website (www.pacd.org) and disseminates the information and resources resident on the site. The site is easily accessed from PACD's homepage or under the Education tab). (<http://pacd.org/education/chesapeake-bay-education-office>).

Resources include:

- General and Pennsylvania-specific information about the Chesapeake Bay
- General and Pennsylvania-specific information about nonpoint source pollution
- Chesapeake Bay Education and other related information distributed weekly in the PACD's electronic update, *Front Page*: <http://pacd.org/news-2/front-page-newsletter>
- A loan library of exhibits and audio visual Chesapeake Bay/NPS-related materials. The library is expanded and updated as needed: <http://pacd.org/education/resources>. Educational exhibits for loan: <http://pacd.org/education/resources/resources-chesapeake-bay>
- Chesapeake Bay fact sheets that promote BMP implementation success stories. An example is available at <http://pacd.org/webfresh/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/No-TillImplement.pdf>
- Sample products from previously funded Chesapeake Bay mini-grant projects (<http://pacd.org/education/educational-events-sample-materials>)
- Links to other Chesapeake Bay sites and other relevant resources (<http://pacd.org/education/chesapeake-bay-education-office/chesapeake-bay-education-links>)

Deliverable #4: Marketing and Promotion

(Ongoing)

PACD conducts “marketing activities” that target the agricultural community and promote local county conservation district programs and services that improve the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay and reduce water pollution. In addition to ongoing, promotional activities such as our website, electronic newsletter, and written materials, we have a presence at the Pennsylvania Farm Show, Ag Progress Days and other relevant events where Chesapeake Bay Education Office materials are given to attendees. Participants at these events are directed to contact their local conservation district to access services that help address PA Chesapeake Bay Program/Tributary Strategy goals. All grant related materials and activities credit Chesapeake Bay program funding support.

Deliverable #5: Chesapeake Bay Clean Water Farm Award

(In Progress)

PACD administers and publicizes the Chesapeake Bay Clean Water Farm Awards program. Program recipients are recognized during the PACD’s Annual Awards Program luncheon and/or at a local conservation district awards ceremony. The Program recognizes Pennsylvania farmers with operations within the Susquehanna and Potomac River Basins, whose exemplary farm management practices result in improved local and downstream water quality. Awards for 2013 were presented at the PACD/SCC Awards Luncheon on July 15, 2013. This awards luncheon was filmed by Pennsylvania Cable Network (PCN) and televised across Pennsylvania.

Deliverable #6: Meeting Attendance and Partnership Communications (Ongoing)

PACD attends local, state, and regional meetings addressing issues of relevance to The Chesapeake Bay Education Office’s scope of work, providing conservation district information and perspectives at those meetings, and communicating back to districts all relevant information. *Examples of PACD representation include the Chesapeake Bay Education Summit, Nutrient and Sediment Trading workgroups, PA State Technical Committee on Education & Outreach, PA Envirothon, PA Environmental Education Advisory Council, PACD Education and Outreach Committee, PA Association for Environmental Educators, and the Chesapeake Bay Advisory Committee, Nutrient Trading Stakeholder Workgroup, etc.*

Objective 4: Technical Assistance Program

Deliverable	Cumulative Progress 12/31/2013	Target outcome Thru 12/31/2013
<i>Nutrient management plans</i>	<i>508 plans</i>	<i>144 nutrient management plans</i>
<i>Technical assistance to landowners</i>	<i>288 BMPs assistance provided</i>	<i>279 BMPs</i>
<i>Implementation Plans prepared/revised</i>	<i>15 plans</i>	<i>27 implementation plans</i>
<i>BMPs designed</i>	<i>276 BMPs designed</i>	<i>49.5 BMPs</i>
<i>Conservation Plans developed</i>	<i>448 plans developed</i>	<i>472.5 conservation plans</i>

Outputs

Activities for the July 2013 – December 2013 period:

207 Nutrient management plans

0 County Implementation Plans
 10 District File Reviews
 35 Compliance Inspections
 30 Conservation plans
 46 BMPs designed
 1,444 Farm Visits this period; 11,122 total visits performed

Objective 5: Chesapeake Bay Cost Share Program

Deliverable	Cumulative Progress 12/31/2013	Target outcome thru 12/31/2013
<i>No Till:</i>	<i>16,760 acres</i>	<i>18,000 acres</i>
<i>Barnyards</i>	<i>50 practices</i>	<i>25 practices</i>
<i>Cover Crops</i>	<i>15,528 acres</i>	<i>40,500 acres</i>
<i>Rotational Grazing</i>	<i>266 acres</i>	<i>225 acres</i>
<i>Stream bank Fencing</i>	<i>30.4 miles</i>	<i>22.5 miles</i>

Activities for the July 2013 – December 2013 period:

641 acres of No-Till
 11 Barnyard Practices
 200 acres of Cover Crops
 0 acres of Rotational Grazing
 14,394 feet of Stream Bank Fencing (appx 3 miles)
 4 crossings
 1 walkway
 1 watering system
 3 grassed waterways

b. Is the work under the agreement on schedule?

Response: Yes

c. Is the actual work being performed within the scope of the recipient's work plan?

Response: Yes

d. In accordance with Resource Management Directive 2520-03-P1, Responsibilities for Reviewing Unliquidated Obligations, does the most current revised workplan specify target dates and milestones for timely project completion to the maximum extent practicable?

http://intranet.epa.gov/ocfo/policies/direct/2520-03-P1_ULO.pdf

Response: Yes

e. Are the recipient's staff and facilities appropriate to handle the work under the agreement?

Response: Yes

f. Based upon the progress reports and this review, is the recipient:

- Generally submitting progress reports as required in the award and on time?

Response: Yes

- **Submitting products/progress reports that are acceptable?**

Response: Yes

- **Has the recipient been notified in writing that the products/progress reports received to date are acceptable or not acceptable and the project file documented accordingly? If not, please notify the recipient and document the project file as a result of this monitoring review?**

Response: Not yet for this increment of progress.

- **Meeting milestones and/or targets described in the award and/or scope of work?**

Response: Yes

Note: Questions g. and h. pertain to environmental results. If your grant was awarded on or after January 1, 2005, the official date the Environmental Results Policy became effective, answer both g. and h. The CBP Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance states that the recipient is required to attach to each applicable performance report (semi-annual, quarterly, or final) an updated Work Plan and Progress Made Performance Results Under Assistance Agreements Form that was submitted with the grant application. If not received, obtain copy from recipient to assist in responding to questions g. and h. and to document file. If your grant was awarded prior to January 1, 2005, answer both questions as "NA".

- g. Is the recipient making agreed-upon progress in achieving outcomes and outputs (to the maximum extent practicable) and associated milestones in the assistance agreement work plan?**

Response: Yes

- h. If the recipient is experiencing significant problems meeting agreed-upon outcomes and outputs, has the recipient been required to develop and implement a corrective action plan?**

Response: No

4. Agreement Specific: POs to discuss which areas apply to this agreement, otherwise, NA:

>Reviewing progress reports and other work products to assure that the recipient is complying with the applicable programmatic regulations and programmatic terms and conditions in the agreement.

> Notifying Grants Office if the recipient is not complying with the terms and conditions of the agreement,

> Providing technical assistance to recipients when requested or required by the programmatic terms and conditions of the award.

>Assisting the recipient, where appropriate, with the development of a plan to conduct subsequent portions of the project.

a.) Pre-Award Costs:: (For more information on pre-award costs, please review: 1) GPI-00-02 (a) entitled, "Clarification on GPI 00-02 Modification to Policy Guidance for 40 CFR Part 31 Pre-Award Costs," (May 3, 2000); 2) 40 CFR 30.25(f)(1) or 40 CFR 30.28 and; 3) 40 CFR 31.23.)

- **Did the recipient incur costs prior to receiving the award?**

Response: Yes

- **If so, was the recipient's written request approved by the PO, file documented, and included on the assistance agreement?**

Response: Yes

b.) Programmatic Conditions, Regulatory, and Statutory Requirements:

1. Programmatic Conditions:

- a. Is the recipient complying with applicable programmatic terms and conditions of the award?**

Response:

- b. Has the recipient submitted Quality Assurance Project Plan (s) (QAPP)? If not applicable, list N/A?**

Response: Yes

If yes, has the QAPP(s) been approved?

Response: Yes

- c. Has the recipient submitted Quality Management Plan(s) (QMP)? If not applicable, list N/A?**

Response: Yes

If yes, has the QMP(s) been approved?

Response: Yes

- d. If applicable, is an approved QMP/QAPP plan documented in file?**

(If QMP/QAPP not in file or approved, find out why? Contact is Mary Ellen Ley.)

Response: Yes

- e. Are all personnel responsible for implementing the QMP/QAPP familiar with its requirements?**

Respond N/A if not applicable.

Response: Yes

- f. Is the recipient submitting quarterly payment requests?** (via TIMELY PAYMENT REQUEST TERM AND CONDITION in Unliquidated Obligations Policy-GPI-11-01 Sec 12)

http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/gpi_11_01_interim_final_9_28_12.pdf

Response: Yes – the last progress report was submitted February 26, 2014 for the period covering July 1 – December 31, 2013.

2. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements: (Statutory pertains to Clean Water Act, Sec 117; Regulatory pertains to 40 CFR Part 30 for Non-Profit Organizations and Universities and Part 31 for State and Local Governments.)

- a. Have all Statutory requirements been met?**

Response: Yes. In support of the Clean Water Act, Section 117, this project supports achievement of nutrient and sediment reductions from point and non-point sources, including agricultural sources to help meet annual performance goals SP35, SP36 and SP37, which is in support of Chesapeake 2000 Agreement – Water Quality Protection & Restoration – to achieve and maintain the Water Quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries and to protect human health.

b. Have all Regulatory requirements been met? (Use this statement provided the requirements in the applicable 40 CFR Part 30 or 31 requirements are being met.)

Response: All regulatory requirements are being met.

c.) Equipment/Supplies:

1. Did the recipient purchase equipment as planned in the agreement and was it used as planned?

Response: NA

If so, request a list of equipment indicating each item purchased and the date and dollar amount of purchase. Attach list to this protocol. (Note: Each item and its cost must be approved in recipient's budget and purchased only during the budget/project period of this assistance agreement.)

2. Did the recipient purchase supplies as planned in the agreement and was it used as planned?

Response: Yes

(Note: Requested and approved supplies should represent only the supplies that are needed to complete the approved workplan. Supplies must be purchased only during the budget/project period of this assistance agreement.)

d.) Travel: Was this authorized in the agreement and was it carried out appropriately?

Response: Yes

e.) Conferences: Did the conference comply with the Best Practices Guide for Conferences?

Response: NA

f.) Contracting practices: Written Code of Conduct/Ethics: Federal regulations require recipients to establish codes of conduct to eliminate any potential conflict of interest and to establish disciplinary actions for those violating the standards. Note: (The minimum requirements are outlined in 40 CFR 30.42, Non-Profit Organizations, Universities; 40 CFR 31.36(3), State and Local Governments.)

1. Contractual Costs: Were contractual/subcontract costs authorized in the assistance agreement? Costs must be approved in the contractual budget category in the assistance agreement.

Response: Yes

If yes, answer the following questions:

- are costs consistent with the approved work plan? Yes
- budget category reflects funds for contracting? Yes
- the recipient reprogrammed funds to contracting? No
- subcontracts SOW consistent with scope of the assistance agreement? Yes

2. Does grant recipient have written contracting procedures?

Response: Yes – they are attached to all DEP contracting documents.

3. Competition: Was the contract competed/sole source; files documented?

Response: Over the five year period of this award, some contracts have been sole sourced and some have been competed.

g. Subawards: Subaward Policy, effective May 15, 2007, requires all new awards and supplemental amendments awarded on or after May 15, 2007 must meet the requirements of the Directive. Subaward costs must be included under the “Other” budget cost category in the assistance agreement.

1. Does the work plan contain subaward work?

Response: Yes

a. If yes, does the recipient have subawards pertinent to the agreement/amendment work plan?

Response: Yes

b. If yes, is the recipient complying with the subaward policy requirements?

Response: Yes

h.) Program Income: (POs must work with the recipient to resolve program-income related issues on agreements that generate program income.)

• Did the project generate unanticipated program income?

Response: No

i.) EPA-Furnished In Kind: Was this satisfactorily used in the assistance agreement?

Response: NA

j.) Recipient Furnished/Third Party In Kind:

• Met the conditions under 40 CFR 30.23 and 40 CFR 31.24?

Response: NA

• Were any adjustments made to the cost share?

Response: NA

**5. Based upon PO review and knowledge of this award, does PO recommend:
(Yes or No Response required)**

a Award Amendment: If yes, explain if the Award Amendment has been discussed with the Program Manager, Supervisor, or Grants Specialist?

Response: No, other than the 6 month nocost extension. A new award is pending July 1, 2014.

b. Advanced Programmatic Monitoring: If needed, discuss with Lori or Holly to either add to current list, if not already on, or next year's PO Advanced Programmatic Monitoring List in the Post Award Monitoring Plan.

Response: No

c. Administrative Review completed by Grants Office: Respond "No". If major concerns exist to check "Yes", discuss with Lori or Holly prior to responding to this question.

Response: No

d. OIG Referral: Respond "No" If major concerns exist to check "Yes", discuss with Lori or Holly prior to responding to this question.

Response: No

e. More Frequent Baseline Monitoring Reviews (less than every six months)

Response: No

6. Project Officer Suggestions and Recommendations (define as either major or minor):

Note: (Recommendations should have corresponding routes to/for resolution specified in report. Also, when major recommendations are made, EPA should explicitly require the recipient to develop and submit a corrective action plan to address the major recommendation.)

Response: Reminder, the recipient should be complying with the 2014 grant guidance.

7. Recipient Recommendations and Suggestions:

Response: None

8. Identify any areas where the recipient is significantly meeting or exceeding programmatic expectations:

Response:

9. Recommendations for the Grants Office, if any:

Response:

10. Closeout Process (Applicable to Closeout Review): Closeout of the award occurs when all applicable administrative actions and all required work of the grant has been completed.

Note: (Project Officer should be aware of the recipients responsibility in the closeout process and review the general regulations (40 CFR 30.71 Universities & Non-Profits and 40 CFR 31.50 State and Local Governments) on Closeout Requirements with grantee.)

a. Are any funds remaining? If so, why and what tasks were not completed?

Response:

b. Has the Final Technical Report been submitted, reviewed, and approved?

Response:

c. Equipment/Supplies: *Project Officers should be aware and review with the recipient the disposition requirements outlined in 40 CFR 30.34 and 30.35 for Non-Profit Organizations and Universities; 40*

CFR 31.32 and 31.33 for State and Local Governments. If the recipient no longer needs the equipment, please request from the recipient a list of equipment purchased, its fair market value and date of purchase.

- **Is the recipient keeping the equipment?**

Response:

- **Is the recipient keeping the supplies?**

Response:

RESOLUTION PLAN AND TIMING - PART III

Prepare Corrective Action Plan, if applicable, to address major recommendation(s):

- 1. Tell the recipient when the corrective action plan is due, and clearly state what should be addressed.**
- 2. Tell the recipient to whom they should send the corrective action plan (EPA contact) and where to send it, including phone number.**

Response:

Note:

1. Send a electronic copy of protocol to the recipient for comment.
 2. cc: Holly Waldman, Annie Hamm
- (Also, send to Holly & Annie any follow-up letters sent to recipient, and relevant e-mail messages)